

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claim 4 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 16, 19, and 21-25 are amended herein.

New claim 28 is added.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 and 5-28 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-27 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER REILLY (USP# 6,427,164)

The present invention as recited in claim 1 (as amended herein), relates to a mail system comprising "a mail sending section sending a particular e-mail, which is addressed to said old destination mail address, to said new destination mail address when said new destination mail address is registered in said mail address manager, and to said old destination mail address when said new destination mail address is not registered in said mail address manager."

Reilly discloses a system for automatically determining if the recipient of electronic mail that is unknown at the receiving server has left a forwarding address with a forwarding address server, thereby allowing either the receiving server, the sending server, or the sending user (computer system), or any other party to the communication, to automatically send the electronic mail content to the correct new address. In column 8, lines 11-30, Reilly asserts, "[t]he receiving server generally refuses to accept mail for this user, and the sending server must either redirect the mail according to the information provided or return an error response to the originating user. According to one embodiment, if the destination username is not found, receiving e-mail server 240 sends an NDR to sending e-mail server 140. Upon receipt of the NDR, sending e-mail server 140 automatically sends a request to the IP address for the Forwarding server 300, asking for a new e-mail address that corresponds to the old e-mail address. According to this embodiment, e-mail server 140 is preferably configured with the address for forwarding server 300. Forwarding server 300 receives the request, which

preferably includes the old e-mail address, and checks its database for any new address associated with the old e-mail address. If User2's new e-mail address has been registered with the forwarding server 300, directly by User2 or through a new ISP, for example, forwarding server 300 looks up and returns the new address to sending e-mail server 140."

According to the above, Reilly is different from the present invention because Reilly teaches sending an e-mail to a second mail address when error has occurred at a first mail address. In the present invention, after an e-mail address of a destination has changed and a new e-mail address is registered by the mail address manager, the e-mail is sent to new e-mail address without occurring an error (see claim 1). Therefore, Reilly does not disclose the features recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 28 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 28 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In item 13, on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 9-27 are similar in scope to claims 1-8 and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 9, however, recites "a mail processing section processing e-mail data, which is contained in the e-mail from the mail source, into such a form receivable by the destination based on said system environment information of the last-named destination which information is stored in said system environment storage section." Claims 20, 22 and 26 recite similar features as those recited in claim 9. It is respectfully submitted that the claimed mail processing section is neither taught nor suggested by Reilly.

Claim 16 recites, "an address list in which a plurality of destination mail addresses the particular e-mail is sent in one lamp are registered" and "a mail address rewriting section, operative upon receipt of a notice that the mail address of at least one destination has been updated, rewriting the old destination mail address, which is registered in said address list, into a new destination mail address," which distinguishes over Reilly.

Claim 19 recites, "a mail address manager managing the mail addresses of the destinations, said mail address manager being operative, in response to updating of the mail address of at least one destination, to register a new destination mail address in correlation with said old destination mail address" and "a mail sending section, responsive to receipt of an e-mail addressed to said old destination mail address, sending the last-named e-mail to said new mail address," which distinguishes over Reilly.

Claim 21 recites, “registering, when the mail address of a particular destination has been updated, said old mail address of the particular destination and a new destination mail address in correlation with each other” and “sending an e-mail, which is addressed to said old destination mail address, to said new destination mail address if the last-named e-mail is addressed to said old destination mail address,” which distinguishes over Reilly.

Claim 23 recites, “a mail address manager for managing mail addresses of destinations and registering, when the mail address of a particular destination has been updated, said old mail address of the particular destination and a new mail address in correlation with each other” and “a mail sending section for sending an e-mail, which is addressed to said old mail address, to said particular destination at said new mail address,” which distinguishes over Reilly.

Claim 27 recites, “a mail address list in which a mail address or addresses of one or more destinations are registered or to be registered” and “a mail address rewriting section which rewrites, upon receipt of a notice that an mail address of a particular destination registered in said mail address list has been updated, the last-named address of said particular destination into a new mail address,” which distinguishes over Reilly.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-28 is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11-12-04

By: 
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501